

COMPUTATION OF SADDLE TYPE SLOW MANIFOLDS USING ITERATIVE METHODS

K. ULDALL KRISTIANSEN*

Department of Applied Mathematics and Computer Science,
Technical University of Denmark,
2800 Kgs. Lyngby,
DK

Abstract. In this paper I present an approach alternative to collocation-type methods, that is based on iterative methods, for the computation of trajectory segments on slow manifolds of saddle type. Such trajectory segments are not computable by direct integration. Compared to collocation methods, that require mesh refinements to ensure uniform convergence with respect to ϵ , appropriate estimates are directly attainable using my approach. I apply the method on a model for a pair of neurons coupled by reciprocal inhibition with two slow and two fast variables and to the computation of homoclinic connections in the FitzHugh-Nagumo system.

Key words. Slow-fast systems, slow manifolds of saddle type, reduction methods.

AMS subject classifications. 34E15, 34E13, 37M99

1. Introduction. Singularly perturbed systems of the form

$$\dot{x} = \epsilon X(x, y), \quad \dot{y} = Y(x, y), \quad (1.1)$$

or

$$x' = X(x, y), \quad y' = \epsilon^{-1} Y(x, y), \quad X, Y \in C^\infty \text{ or } C^\omega, \quad (1.2)$$

with $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_s}$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n_f}$ being the slow resp. fast variables, arise in wide variety of scientific problems. Here $(\cdot)$ denotes the derivative with respect to the fast time t whereas $(\cdot)'$ denotes differentiation with respect to the slow time $\tau = \epsilon t$. The vector-fields X and Y may in general also depend upon ϵ . For simplicity I shall, however, always suppress the ϵ -dependency. Important examples include: Meteorology and short-term weather forecasting [25, 26, 38], molecular physics and the Born-Oppenheimer approximation [29], chemical enzyme kinetics and the Michaelis-Menten mechanism [30], predator-prey and reaction-diffusion models [31], the evolution and stability of the solar system [23, 24] and the modeling of tethered satellites [40, 41]. These systems can also be “artificially constructed” by a partial scaling of variables near a bifurcation [34]. The main advantage of identifying slow and fast variables is dimension reduction by which all the fast variables are “slaved” to the slow ones through the *slow manifold*.

Slow manifolds. Consider the set of constrained equilibria $M_0 = \{(x, y) | Y(x, y) = 0\}$ with the spectrum $\text{spec}(\partial_y Y|_{M_0})$ satisfying

$$\text{dist}(\text{spec}(\partial_y Y|_{M_0}), i\mathbb{R}) \geq c > 0, \quad c \text{ independent of } \epsilon. \quad (1.3)$$

Here $\partial_y Y$ is the Jacobian of Y . Condition (1.3) implies, by the implicit function theorem, that M_0 is a graph of some function $y = \eta_0(x)$, that is $M_0 = \{(x, y) | y = \eta_0(x)\}$. For $\epsilon = 0$ this manifold M_0 is a fixed point set for (1.1) which is normally hyperbolic. It is referred to as the critical manifold. Fenichel’s theory [6, 7] then applies to M_0 so that there exists an invariant manifold $M_h = \{y = \eta(x)\}$, with η smooth but typically non-analytic, which is $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ -close to M_0 . The slow manifold M_h is attracting if $\text{spec}(\partial_y Y|_{M_0}) \subset \{z \in \mathbb{C} | \text{Re} z < 0\}$ or repelling if $\text{spec}(\partial_y Y|_{M_0}) \subset \{z \in \mathbb{C} | \text{Re} z > 0\}$. Otherwise it is of saddle type. In this case there are both a stable manifold $W_s(M_h)$, on which trajectories are attracted exponentially fast towards M_h forward in time, and an unstable manifold $W_u(M_h)$, on which trajectories are attracted exponentially fast towards M_h backwards in time [16].

If on the other hand $\text{spec}(\partial_y Y|_{M_0})$ is not disjoint from the imaginary axis, but instead only satisfy

$$\text{dist}(\text{spec}(\partial_y Y|_{M_0}), 0) \geq c > 0, \quad (1.4)$$

*The author was funded by a H. C. Ørsted post doc grant.

c independent of ϵ , then the normal motion is still fast but there is in general no invariant slow manifold nearby [28]. However, if the vector-field

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon X \\ Y \end{pmatrix} \quad (1.5)$$

is analytic then there is in this case some M_ϵ on which the restriction of the vector-field has exponentially small angle $\mathcal{O}(e^{-c/\epsilon})$ with the tangent space [10, 42]. The slow manifold M_ϵ is therefore exponentially close to being invariant.

STSM algorithm. The computation of trajectories following saddle type slow manifolds M_h for a long time, $\Delta t = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-1})$ or $\Delta \tau = \mathcal{O}(1)$, cannot be archived by any “stiff” integration method. Even an exact initial value solver in the presence of round-off errors of magnitude δ will amplify this error to unit size in a time of order $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon \log \delta^{-1})$ [13]. I will here refer to such highly unstable orbits as canards or perhaps more accurately canard segments. Guckenheimer and Kuehn in [13] developed a collocation based algorithm SMST (*Slow Manifolds of Saddle Type*) for the computation of such trajectories. The method starts from an initial guess provided by the slow subsystem:

$$x' = X(x, \eta_0(x)), \quad (1.6)$$

with $x(0) = x_0$ and $\tau \in [0, T]$. Here $T = \mathcal{O}(1)$ with respect to ϵ . Set $z = (x, y)$. The SMST algorithm then solves for a solution $z = z(\tau)$ that approaches the slow manifold near $z_0 = (x_0, \eta_0(x_0))$ and exits it near $z_T = (x(T), \eta_0(x(T)))$. For this time is discretized $0 = \tau_0 < \tau_1 < \dots < \tau_N = T$ and on each mesh $\tau_i \leq \tau \leq \tau_{i+1}$ the $z = z(\tau)$ is replaced by a cubic interpolation based on the values $z_i = z(\tau_i)$, $z_{i+1} = z(\tau_{i+1})$ and the tangent vectors $z'_i = V(z_i)$, $z'_{i+1} = V(z_{i+1})$. Here $V = \epsilon^{-1}U$ with U given in (1.5). The dynamical constraint $z' = V(z)$ is then enforced at the mid-points $\tau_{i+1/2} = \frac{1}{2}(\tau_i + \tau_{i+1})$ using this cubic interpolation of $z = z(\tau)$. See also Eq. (2.1) in [13]. This gives $n \times N$ equations for the $(n+1)N$ unknowns $z_0, z_1, \dots, z_N$. The remaining equations are obtained from the boundary conditions which may be included in the following way. By assumption the matrix $\partial_y Y(z)$ introduces a splitting of the form $E_s^z \oplus E_u^z = \mathbb{R}^{n_f}$ where $E_s^z = E_s^z(x)$ and $E_u^z = E_u^z(x)$ can be interpreted as the stable and unstable eigenspaces of the *constrained hyperbolic equilibria* $y = \eta(x)$ of $\dot{y} = Y(x, y)$. Fenichel’s theory guarantees that E_s^z and E_u^z are transverse to $W_u(M_h)$ resp. $W_s(M_h)$. Let π_s^z and π_u^z be the projection onto E_s^z resp. E_u^z . Then at $\tau = 0$ one specifies $x(0) = x_0$ and “the stable components” of $y(0) = \eta_0(x_0) + y_{s0} + y_{u0}$ by fixing

$$y_{s0} = \pi_s^{z_0}(y(0) - \eta_0(x_0)), \quad (\text{e.g.} = 0). \quad (1.7)$$

At $\tau = T$ one, on the other hand, specifies the “unstable components” of $y(T) = \eta_0(x_T) + y_{sT} + y_{uT}$ by fixing

$$y_{uT} = \pi_u^{z_T}(y(T) - \eta_0(x_T)), \quad (\text{e.g.} = 0). \quad (1.8)$$

Here $\eta_0(x_T)$ is the value of the fast variables, when using (1.6) for the propagation of the slow variables, at $\tau = T$. From the cubic interpolation the sparse Jacobian can be computed explicitly and a Newton method can be used to obtain an accurate solution. Note that Fenichel’s theory implies that y_{u0} and y_{sT} are each $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ since the stable and unstable fibers are $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ to the unperturbed ones. Assume that this procedure converges to a solution $\sigma = \sigma(t)$ and that $z = z(t)$ is a true solution of $z' = V(z)$ that satisfies the $n(N+1)$ conditions. Then by Taylor’s formula

$$\begin{aligned} \|\sigma - z\| &\leq \frac{1}{24} \sup_{\tau \in [0, T]} z^{(4)}(\tau) \max_i |\tau_{i+1} - \tau_i|^4 \\ &\leq \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-4} \max_i |\tau_{i+1} - \tau_i|^4). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore if a mesh is fixed, then based on this estimate, one will expect the error to grow as ϵ goes to zero. A Shishkin mesh [19], basically invoking piecewise uniform meshes placing more points at ends where the fast transitions occur, may allow for convergence estimates that are uniform with respect to ϵ in singular perturbed systems.

Finally, I highlight that there are many examples where periodic orbits (e.g. Van der Pol system [12], model for reciprocal inhibition [13, 11]) or homoclinic orbits (e.g. FitzHugh-Nagumo [14, 13, 15, 16, 20])

have canard segments. For the computation of such orbits the SMST algorithm will in general have to be combined with a separate part that computes the remaining trajectory segments (e.g. via direct integration of (1.2)).

Aims of paper. In this paper I suggest a different approach for the computation of trajectories on saddle type slow manifolds. I will base this on two iterative methods: The SO method (the method of *Straightening Out*, also referred to as the iterative method of Fraser and Roussel) [8, 35, 28, 42] and the SOF method (*Straightening Out Fibers*) [39]. The SO method will first be used in a modified Runge-Kutta scheme for the propagation of the slow variables. This procedure also applies to attracting or repelling slow manifolds and even normally elliptic ones. In [33] an alternative numerical scheme is suggested. This is based on asymptotic expansions which require the user to provide several partial derivatives of the vector-field U with respect to the slow and fast variables but also with respect to the small parameter. The SO method circumvents this issue by only requiring the user to provide U and the Jacobian $\partial_z U$. This also makes the method potentially useful in ϵ -free systems [3, 2, 4, 18].

There are several alternative methods to the SO method for the approximation of slow manifolds. I name a few others: The intrinsic low-dimensional manifold (ILDm) method of Maas and Pope [27], the zero-derivative principle (ZDP) [9, 44], and the computational singular perturbation (CSP) method initially due to Lam and Goussis [21, 22], and later thoroughly analyzed by Zagaris and co-workers [45]. The ILDM method is based on the Jacobian of the vector-field and partitions this at each point into a fast and a slow component based on spectral gaps of the Jacobian. The ILDM approximation to the slow manifold is then defined as the locus of points where the vector-field lies entirely in the slow subspace. In general, this only gives an approximation that agrees up to $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ [17]. In the ZDP method an $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^n)$ -accurate approximation to the slow manifold is obtained as the locus of points where the $(n+1)$ th time derivative of the fast variables vanishes. This method has been used in an equation-free setting in [9]. The CSP method also provides $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^n)$ -approximations of the slow manifolds [45] and it is, as the ILDM, based on the decomposition of the tangent space into fast and slow subspaces. The SO method is, however, unique in that it is the only method, as far as I am aware of, that possess all of the following properties. (i): It leads to exponential accurate slow manifolds. (ii): It can be written in a form (see (2.9) below) that only involves the vector-field, hence avoiding the lengthy details of e.g. asymptotic expansions. (iii): It does not require smoothness of X and Y in ϵ . (iv): The slow manifold includes nearby equilibria. For the purpose of this work I find (ii) to be the most important property. Property (iii) might seem rather academic, but I believe it highlights the methods potential in ϵ -free systems: The proof of statement (i) is not based on comparisons with asymptotic expansions in ϵ . In the forthcoming paper [4] I and my co-author apply the SO method in ϵ -free systems.

It is not possible to approach trajectories on the slow manifold directly using collocation methods such as the SMST method. The SMST method will always include fast connections at ends. For the computations of such transients I will augment the SOF method [40] to the SO modified Runge-Kutta scheme. I will here be using that the transients take no more than $\Delta t = \mathcal{O}(1)$ on the fast time scale to develop a collocation algorithm on the fast space using only $\mathcal{O}(1)$ equations. I will describe this in more details in section 2.

Outline of paper. In section 2 I present the different iterative methods. Firstly, the SO method is presented in section 2.1. Here I also state and prove a proposition on a modified SO method which is due to Neishtadt which is computationally simpler. In section 2.2 I then proceed to present results on the numerical implementation of the SO method via finite differences. This section also covers its use in the modified Runge-Kutta scheme. Finally, section 2.3 presents the SOF method along with a result on its discretized version. I consider one example with a saddle type slow manifold, and to demonstrate the potential of the SO method for oscillatory systems, I also consider an example with a normally elliptic slow manifold. These examples seek to further demonstrate the properties of the iterative methods. Finally, section 3 presents the SO-SMST method (*Straightening Out for Slow Manifolds of Saddle Types*) for the computation of canard trajectories and their transients. This section includes some error estimates. In section 4 I apply this method to a nonlinear model of reciprocal inhibition with two slow and two fast variables. The results will be compared with trajectories computed using the SMST algorithm. Finally in section 5 I compute homoclinic connections for the FitzHugh-Nagumo model.

Main results. I collect the main results of the paper in the following:

- In Corollary 2.5 I present a discrete version of the SO-method for the point-wise approximation of a slow manifold using the principle of Neishtadt to reduce the computational complexity of the SO-method. The discreteness replaces a differential operator with a finite difference operator and

Corollary 2.5 shows that the error is of order $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2 h^p)$, h a step-size and p the order of the finite difference operation.

- In Proposition 2.9 I similarly present a discrete version of the modification of the SOF method also using the principle of Neishtadt to reduce the complexity. The error is $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon h^p)$.
- In section 3 I present the most important result of the paper by demonstrating how the SOF method can be applied for the approximation of canard segments for saddle type slow manifolds. Proposition 3.1 and Proposition 3.3 describe the errors associated with this approximation.

2. The iterative methods.

2.1. The SO method: Approximation of the slow manifold. An invariant slow manifold $y = \eta(x)$ of (1.1) satisfies the following *invariance equation*

$$-\epsilon \partial_x \eta(x) X(x, \eta(x)) + Y(x, \eta(x)) = 0. \quad (2.1)$$

To explain the SO method suppose that $y = \zeta_0(x)$ is an approximation to the slow manifold in the sense that it satisfies (2.1)

$$-\epsilon \partial_x \zeta_0(x) X(x, \zeta_0(x)) + Y(x, \zeta_0(x)) = \rho_0(x) \quad (2.2)$$

up to a small error $\delta_0 = \sup_x \|\rho_0(x)\|$. Then introduce y_0 by

$$y = \zeta_0(x) + y_0. \quad (2.3)$$

The transformation (2.3) *straightens out* the approximation of the slow manifold $y = \zeta_0(x)$ to $y_0 = 0$. I obtain new equations for y_0 :

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{y}_0 &= Y_0(x, y_0) \equiv -\epsilon \partial_x \zeta_0 X(x, \zeta_0(x) + y_0) + Y(x, \zeta_0(x) + y_0) \\ &= \rho_0(x) + A_0(x) y_0 + R_0(x, y_0), \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

with ρ_0 as in (2.2),

$$A_0(x) = -\epsilon \partial_x \zeta_0(x) \partial_y X(x, \zeta_0(x)) + \partial_y Y(x, \zeta_0(x)),$$

and $R_0 = \mathcal{O}(y_0^2)$. The equality in (2.4) is due to the Taylor expansion of Y_0 about $y_0 = 0$. The term ρ_0 is the *obstacle* to invariance of the slow manifold. Here $\|(\partial_y Y)^{-1}\| \ll \epsilon^{-1}$ by assumption of y being fast (1.4), cf. [28], and $A_0(x)$ is therefore invertible for ϵ sufficiently small. Also since δ_0 is small, there exists a solution $\eta_1 = \eta_1(x) \approx -A_0(x)^{-1} \rho_0(x)$ of $Y_0(x, \eta_1) = 0$:

$$\rho_0(x) + A_0(x) \eta_1 + R_0(x, \eta_1) = 0, \quad (2.5)$$

satisfying

$$\sup_x \|\eta_1(x)\| = \mathcal{O}(\delta_0). \quad (2.6)$$

Note also that (2.5) cf. (2.4) can be written as

$$-\epsilon \partial_x \zeta_0(x) X(x, \zeta_0(x) + \eta_1(x)) + Y_0(x, \zeta_0(x) + \eta_1(x)) = 0. \quad (2.7)$$

Now, straighten out this new approximation $y_0 = \eta_1(x)$ of the slow manifold to $y_1 = 0$ by setting $y_0 = \eta_1(x) + y_1$ so that

$$\dot{y}_1 = Y_1(x, y_1) = \rho_1(x) + A_1(x) y_1 + R_1(x, y_1),$$

with

$$\rho_1(x) = -\epsilon \partial_x \eta_1(x) X(x, \zeta_0(x) + \eta_1(x)). \quad (2.8)$$

If the vector-fields X and Y are analytic then I can apply Cauchy estimates to estimate $\sup_x \|\partial_x \eta_1(x)\|$ in terms of $\sup_x \|\eta_1(x)\|$ on a smaller domain so that

$$\delta_1 \equiv \sup_x \|\rho_1(x)\| = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon \delta_0).$$

Hence the new error is of the order of ϵ times the previous error. If I start with $\zeta_0 = \eta_0$ then the error ρ is $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ and applying the procedure successively therefore directly leads to formal error estimates of the form $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{k+1})$, even when the vector-field U is only C^r , $r \geq k+1$. In terms of the original variables the approximation takes the form

$$y = \eta^k(x) = \zeta_0(x) + \eta_1(x) + \cdots + \eta_k(x).$$

Note the use of superscript to indicate summation over the subscripts. The $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{k+1})$ -estimate is not uniform in k : In the analytic case the domain of definition will eventually vanish when iteratively applying the Cauchy estimates. Using Neishstadt type estimates it was, however, shown in [42] that the error can be made exponentially small. This also holds for normally elliptic slow manifolds, which confirmed a conjecture by MacKay [28].

The form in (2.7) immediately implies that the procedure can be written compactly as

$$-\epsilon \partial_x \eta^{n-1}(x) X(x, \eta^n(x)) + Y(x, \eta^n(x)) = 0. \quad (2.9)$$

for the approximation $y = \eta^n(x)$ of $y = \eta(x)$ satisfying (2.1). When starting from $\eta^{-1} \equiv 0$, then $\eta^0|_{\epsilon=0} = \eta_0|_{\epsilon=0}$ solving $Y(x, \eta^0)|_{\epsilon=0} = 0$ is just the critical manifold. This is the usually representation of the SO method. In this form it is also known as the iterative method of Fraser and Roussel [17]. The representation of the SO-method above, which is due to MacKay, has the advantage that it shows that I do not need to start the procedure from η_0 . I could also just start from a guess $y = \zeta_0(x)$ and solve

$$-\epsilon \partial_x (\zeta_0(x) + \eta^{n-1}(x)) X(x, \zeta_0(x) + \eta^n(x)) + Y(x, \zeta_0 + \eta^n(x)) = 0, \quad (2.10)$$

for η^n starting from $\eta^{-1} \equiv 0$. The new error will still be ϵ times a C^1 estimate of the previous error cf. (2.6). I will return to this later when using the method in an adapted Runge-Kutta scheme. Either way, the method will still at each step involve solving a non-linear equation. So from a computational point of view this involves two loops: An outer loop updating n and an inner loop using e.g. a Newton method for the solution η^n of the nonlinear equation (2.9) or (2.10). The results of Neishstadt in [32, Lemma 1] shows, however, that this inner loop is actually not necessary. Furthermore, the matrix-valued functions $A_i = A_i(x)$ need not be updated. To present this, however, I first need to introduce some notation. All norms will be denoted by $\|\cdot\|$ including operator norms, a convention already adapted above. I hope this does not cause unnecessary confusion. If $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then I will by $\mathcal{U} + i\chi$ denote its complex χ -neighborhood:

$$\mathcal{U} + i\chi = \{x \in \mathbb{C}^n \mid \sup_{y \in \mathcal{U}} \|x - y\| < \chi\}.$$

Consider $f : \mathcal{U} + i\chi \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^m$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, being analytic and bounded. Then Cauchy-estimates apply to f in the following sense

$$\sup_{x_0 \in \mathcal{U} + (\chi - \xi)} \|\partial_x f(x_0)\| \leq \frac{\sup_{x \in \mathcal{U} + \chi} \|f(x)\|}{\xi},$$

which I will write compactly as

$$\|\partial_x f\|_{\chi - \xi} \leq \frac{\|f(x)\|_{\chi}}{\xi}.$$

PROPOSITION 2.1. (*Modified SO method, Lemma 1 in [32]*) Consider the slow-fast system (1.1) with X and Y analytic on some complex (χ, ν) -neighborhood $(x, y) \in (\mathcal{U} + i\chi) \times (\mathcal{V} + i\nu)$ of $\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V}$ for some real open and bounded sets $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{n_s}$ resp. $\mathbb{R}^{n_f}$. Assume furthermore that $y = \zeta_0(x)$ is an approximation

to the slow manifold that satisfies the invariance equation (2.1) with small error $\delta_0 = \|\rho_0\|_\chi$. Then for ϵ and δ_0 sufficiently small the transformation

$$y = \eta(x) + \tilde{y},$$

$\eta \equiv \eta^{N(\epsilon)} = \zeta_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{N(\epsilon)} \eta_n$ with $N(\epsilon) = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-1})$ and $\eta_n = \eta_n(x)$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_n(x) &= -A_0(x)^{-1} \rho_{n-1}(x), \\ \rho_{n-1}(x) &= -\epsilon \partial_x \eta_{n-1}(x) X(x, \eta^{n-1}(x)) + Y(x, \eta^{n-1}(x)), \\ A_0(x) &= -\epsilon \partial_x \zeta_0(x) \partial_y X(x, \zeta_0(x)) + \partial_y Y(x, \zeta_0(x)). \end{aligned} \tag{2.11}$$

will on $\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{V}$ transform (1.1) into

$$\dot{\tilde{y}} = \tilde{\rho}(x) + \tilde{A}(x) \tilde{y} + \tilde{R}(x, \tilde{y})$$

with $\tilde{R} = \mathcal{O}(\tilde{y}^2)$ and

$$\|\tilde{\rho}\|_0 = \mathcal{O}(e^{-c/\epsilon}),$$

with $c > 0$ independent of ϵ and δ .

Proof. I sketch the proof here. For all the details I refer the reader to [32]. At the n th-step the equations take the following form

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= \epsilon X_{n-1}(x, y_{n-1}), \\ \dot{y}_{n-1} &= Y_{n-1}(x, y_{n-1}) \rho_{n-1}(x) + (A_0(x) + a_{n-1}(x)) y_{n-1} + R_{n-1}(x, y_{n-1}), \end{aligned}$$

with $\delta_{n-1} = \|\rho_{n-1}\|_{\nu_{n-1}}$ and $\|a_{n-1}\|_{\nu_{n-1}} = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon + \delta_0)$. I then introduce y_n according to (2.11):

$$y_{n-1} = \eta_n(x) + y_n,$$

giving

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= \epsilon X_n(x, y_n), \\ \dot{y}_n &= \rho_n(x) + (A_0(x) + a_n(x)) y_n + R_n(x, y_n). \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\rho_n = -\epsilon \partial_x \eta_n(x) X_{n-1}(x, \eta_n) + a_{n-1} \eta_n + R_{n-1}(x, \eta_n), \tag{2.12}$$

$$a_n = -\epsilon \partial_x \eta_n \partial_y X_{n-1}(x, \eta_n) + a_{n-1}(x) + \partial_y R(x, \eta_n), \tag{2.13}$$

and $X_n(x, y_n) = X_{n-1}(x, \eta_n + y_n)$. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho_n\|_{\nu_n} &\leq c_n (\epsilon \xi_n^{-1} \delta_{n-1} + (\epsilon + \delta_0) \delta_{n-1} + \delta_{n-1}^2), \\ \nu_n &= \nu_{n-1} - \xi_n, \end{aligned}$$

for some $c_n > 0$, upon applying a Cauchy estimate. The last two terms are subordinate to the first term and I can therefore take $\xi_n = 4c_n \epsilon$ so that for δ_{n-1} sufficiently small

$$\|\rho_n\|_{\nu_n} \leq \frac{1}{2} \delta_{n-1}.$$

Also $\|a_n\|_{\nu_n} = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon + \delta_0)$. One can then easily bound $c_n \leq 2c_0$ for ϵ sufficiently small and therefore uniformly bound the ξ_n 's and take $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-1})$ steps before the domain vanishes. This gives the exponential estimate.

□

REMARK 2.2. The error ρ_0 is given by

$$\rho_0(x) = -\epsilon \partial_x \zeta_0(x) \partial_y X(x, \zeta_0(x)) + Y(x, \zeta_0(x)).$$

If $\zeta_0 = \eta_0$ then this vanishes at any equilibrium of the form $(x, y) = (x^e, \eta_0(x^e))$ where $X(x^e, \eta_0(x^e)) = 0$ and $Y(x^e, \eta_0(x^e)) = 0$. Therefore $\eta_1(x^e) = 0$ cf. (2.11) in this case and it follows, from (2.12) and (2.13) with $n = 1$, $a_0 \equiv 0$ and the fact that the Taylor series of R_0 starts with quadratic terms in the second argument, that $\rho_1(x^e) = 0$. The modified procedure will preserve this property so that $\rho_{n-1}(x^e) = 0$ and hence all of the approximations η^n will include all initially nearby equilibria.

REMARK 2.3. A remarkable property of the SO method is that it does not require A_0 to be bounded. Only A_0^{-1} is measured, making the method potentially useful for slow ODE - fast PDE systems like the one in [40]. In the following section I will consider the numerical implementation of the SO method.

2.2. Numerical implementation of the SO method. By applying the SO method one can accurately approximate the slow manifold $y = \eta(x)$. On the slow manifold, the variables can then be propagated according to the reduced slow subsystem:

$$x' = X(x, \eta(x)).$$

In the numerics that I will present I will be using a classical 4th order Runge-Kutta scheme on this reduced problem. Starting from $x(\tau) = x_0$ the Runge-Kutta method approximates $x(\tau + \delta\tau) = x_1$ as

$$x_1 = x_0 + \frac{1}{6} (\kappa_1 + 2\kappa_2 + 2\kappa_3 + \kappa_4),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_1 &= \delta\tau X(x_0, \eta(x_0)), \\ \kappa_2 &= \delta\tau X(x_0 + 0.5\kappa_1, \eta(x_0 + 0.5\kappa_1)), \\ \kappa_3 &= \delta\tau X(x_0 + 0.5\kappa_2, \eta(x_0 + 0.5\kappa_2)), \\ \kappa_4 &= \delta\tau X(x_0 + \kappa_3, \eta(x_0 + \kappa_3)).\end{aligned}$$

See e.g. [5]. Here $\delta\tau$ is the time step on the slow time scale. The local error is $\mathcal{O}(\delta\tau^5)$ while the accumulated error is $\mathcal{O}(\delta\tau^4)$. The SO method has to be used to determine $\eta = \eta(x)$ at the four different points

$$x = x_0, \quad x_0 + 0.5\kappa_1, \quad x_0 + 0.5\kappa_2, \quad \text{and} \quad x_0 + \kappa_3. \quad (2.14)$$

For this I replace the differential operator ∂_x by a finite difference operator δ_x^h satisfying

$$(\partial_x - \delta_x^h)f = \mathcal{O}(h^p), \quad (2.15)$$

for all smooth f . As an example, one could take

$$\delta_{x_i}^h f(x) = \frac{f(x + he_i) - f(x - he_i)}{2h}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n_s, \quad (2.16)$$

with $(e_i)_j = \delta_{ij}$ Kronecker's delta and set

$$\delta_x^h f = (\delta_{x_1}^h f \cdots \delta_{x_{n_s}}^h f).$$

Then $p = 2$ since:

$$\|(\partial_{x_i} - \delta_{x_i}^h)f(x)\| \leq \frac{\sup_{t \in [0,1]} \|\partial_{x_i}^3 f(x + the_i)\|}{6} h^2. \quad (2.17)$$

Also Cauchy-type estimate apply to δ_x^h in the sense that

$$\|\delta_x^h f\|_{\chi-\xi} \leq \frac{C_p \|f\|_{\chi}}{\xi}, \quad C_p \geq 1, \quad (2.18)$$

provided $h < \xi$ is sufficiently small and that f is analytic. For (2.16), for example, with $h \leq \xi/2$ I have

$$\|\delta_{x_i}^h f\|_{\chi-\xi} \leq \frac{3\|f\|_{\chi}}{\xi},$$

using (2.17) and a Cauchy estimate of $\|\partial_{x_i}^3 f\|_{\chi-\xi+h}$. Therefore

$$\|\delta_x^h f\|_{\chi-\xi} \leq \frac{3n_s \|f\|_{\chi}}{\xi},$$

and $C_p = 3n_s > 1$ in this case. The discretized version of the invariance equation

$$-\epsilon \delta_x^h \eta^h(x) X(x, \eta^h(x)) + Y(x, \eta^h(x)) = 0, \quad (2.19)$$

can then be solved by the SO principle to obtain an approximate solution η^h with exponential small error:

$$-\epsilon \delta_x^h \eta^h(x) X(x, \eta^h(x)) + Y(x, \eta^h(x)) = \mathcal{O}(e^{-c_p/\epsilon}). \quad (2.20)$$

Here c_p is independent of ϵ and h . I therefore have:

PROPOSITION 2.4. *Consider a finite difference operator δ_x^h satisfying (2.15) and (2.18). Provided ϵ is sufficiently small, then applying SO method, or the modified SO method, to (2.19) gives an approximate solution η^h that satisfies*

$$-\epsilon \partial_x \eta^h(x) X(x, \eta^h(x)) + Y(x, \eta^h(x)) = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon \|\eta^h\| h^p + e^{-c_p/\epsilon}). \quad (2.21)$$

Proof. I write

$$\partial_x \eta^h = \delta_x^h \eta^h - (\partial_x^h - \delta_x^h) \eta^h$$

in (2.21) and use (2.15) and (2.20) to estimate the error. $\square$

From $Y(x, \eta_0(x)) = 0$ I can obtain $\partial_x \eta_0 = -(\partial_y Y)^{-1} \partial_x Y$ in the first step. The error from replacing ∂_x with δ_x^h does then not appear before the second step. This gives rise to the improved order $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2 h^p)$ in (2.21). I could then continue with the modified SO method:

COROLLARY 2.5. *Provided ϵ is sufficiently small, then applying the procedure:*

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_n^h(x) &= -A_0(x)^{-1} \rho_{n-1}(x), \\ \rho_{n-1}(x) &= -\epsilon (\partial_x \eta_0(x) + \delta_x^h (\eta^{n-1,h}(x) - \eta_0(x))) X(x, \eta^{n-1,h}(x)) + Y(x, \eta^{n-1,h}(x)), \\ A_0(x) &= -\epsilon \partial_x \eta_0(x) \partial_y X(x, \eta_0(x)) + \partial_y Y(x, \eta_0(x)), \\ \eta^{m,h} &= \eta_0 + \sum_{n=1}^m \eta_n^h, \end{aligned} \quad (2.22)$$

generates an approximate solution $\eta^h = \eta_0 + \sum_{n=1}^{N(\epsilon)} \eta_n^h$, $N(\epsilon) = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-1})$, satisfying

$$-\epsilon \partial_x \eta^h X(x, \eta^h) + Y(x, \eta^h) = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2 h^p + e^{-c_p/\epsilon}). \quad (2.23)$$

The derivative $\partial_x \eta_0$ is obtained through $Y(x, \eta_0(x)) = 0$:

$$\partial_x \eta_0(x) = -(\partial_y Y(x, \eta_0(x)))^{-1} \partial_x Y(x, \eta_0(x)).$$

Note how I have approximated $\partial_x \eta^{n-1,h}$ as $\partial_x \eta_0(x) + \delta_x^h (\eta^{n-1,h}(x) - \eta_0(x))$ in (2.22). I further stress the simplicity of this method: It only requires the first partial derivatives of the vector-field.

2.2.1. h -grid. In the Runge-Kutta scheme I will need to determine $\eta^h(x)$ at the different x -values (2.14). Consider for example $\eta^h(x_0)$. I then set up a grid around x_0 , and will base my δ_x^h on Lagrange interpolation polynomials derived from function values at the 3^{n_s} points:

$$x_0 + e_h \quad \text{with} \quad (e_h)_i = 0, \text{ or } \pm h.$$

This gives $p = 2$ in (2.21) and (2.23). The following is important: Seeing that h is small I can take A_0 to be constant on the h -grid. The error from this can be collected into $a_n = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon + h)$ cf. (2.13) and does therefore not change the result. A_0^{-1} can therefore be stored outside the iteration in n .

Cf. (2.21) I can by letting $\epsilon h^2 \sim \delta \tau^5$ or $h^2 \sim \epsilon^{-1} \delta \tau^5$ match the order of the Runge-Kutta scheme with the order of the approximation of the slow manifold η . If I use η_0 explicitly as described in Corollary 2.5 I can instead let $h^2 \sim \epsilon^{-2} \delta \tau^5$.

EXAMPLE 2.6. Here I consider the toy problem:

$$\dot{x} = \epsilon \begin{pmatrix} \cos x_1 + y_1 + \cos x_2 y_2 \\ -\sin x_2 + y_2 + \sin x_1 y_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.24)$$

$$\dot{y} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos x_2 - y_1 \\ -\sin x_1 + y_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.25)$$

which is linear in the fast variables but non-linear in the slow ones. From the Jacobian matrix $\partial_y Y = \text{diag}(-1, 1)$ it follows that the slow manifold is of saddle type. The SO method can then be used to compute η explicitly which I in Fig. 2.1 compare with a numerical solution η^h at $x = (-0.5, -0.7)^T$. I use Maple to compute η explicitly and include terms up to order ϵ^8 . In both figures I have set $h = \epsilon$, however, in (b) I use Corollary 2.5 and η_0 :

$$\eta_0 = \begin{pmatrix} \cos x_2 \\ \sin x_1 \end{pmatrix},$$

explicitly. The orders are $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3)$ resp. $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^4)$ in agreement with the analysis above, see (2.21) and (2.23).




FIGURE 2.1. The error $\|\eta^h - \eta\|$ for the toy problem (2.24) for $h = \epsilon = 10^{-3}$. Figure (b) is based on Corollary 2.5 using η_0 explicitly.

In Fig. 2.2 I compare the results of applying the modified Runge-Kutta scheme to

$$x' = \begin{pmatrix} \cos x_1 + \eta_1 + \cos x_2 \eta_2 \\ -\sin x_2 + \eta_2 + \sin x_1 \eta_1 \end{pmatrix}$$

with a high-precision solution using Matlab's ode45 for different values of $\delta \tau$ for $\epsilon = 10^{-3}$. I started the integration from $x(0) = (-0.5, -0.7)^T$ and integrated up until $\tau = 10$. The absolute and relative tolerances of ode45 were set to 10^{-12} and I used $\eta = (\eta_1, \eta_2)^T$ from the Maple computation, again including terms up to order ϵ^8 . In the modified Runge-Kutta scheme I used the method described in Corollary 2.5 using η_0 and $\partial_x \eta_0$ explicitly, stopping the iteration when the error

$$\| -\epsilon \delta_x^h \eta X(x, \eta) + Y(x, \eta) \|, \quad (2.26)$$

had reached below a tolerance tol , which I here set to be 10^{-12} . I used

$$h = \min\{10^{-2}, 0.1 \delta \tau^5 / \epsilon^2\},$$

the factor 0.1 being a “safety factor” aiming to ensure that the error from the approximation of η was subordinate to the error of the Runge-Kutta scheme. Moreover, I ensured that h was always $\leq 10^{-2}$. Figure (a) shows the global $\mathcal{O}(\delta\tau^4)$ convergence while (b) shows the reference ode45 solutions x_1 (—) and x_2 (---) in comparison with the solutions ($\diamond$) obtained by the modified Runge-Kutta scheme for $\delta\tau = 0.5$. Finally (c) shows the result of direct simulation for 16 initial conditions displaced by distances of $\pm 10^{-4}, \pm 10^{-5}, \dots, \pm 10^{-11}$ from the slow manifold along its unstable directions. I use Matlab’s ode15s with tolerances set to 10^{-12} for the propagation on the full space. Of all the pairs, only for the one with $\pm 10^{-11}$ do the trajectories jump in the same direction. This indicates that the slow manifold is correct up until 10^{-10} .




FIGURE 2.2. The results of applying the modified Runge-Kutta scheme to the toy problem (2.24). Figure (a) shows the $\mathcal{O}(\delta\tau^4)$ convergence of the Runge-Kutta scheme. (b) compares the solution obtained by the modified Runge-Kutta scheme ($\diamond$) with an accurate reference solution (—, ---). Finally (c) shows the result of an accurate direct simulation on the full system for 16 initial conditions displaced by distances of $\pm 10^{-4}, \pm 10^{-5}, \dots, \pm 10^{-11}$ from the slow manifold along its unstable directions. Of all the pairs, only for the one with $\pm 10^{-11}$ do the trajectories jump in the same direction.

To demonstrate the use of this procedure for normally elliptic slow manifolds I consider the following example due to Neishstadt:

EXAMPLE 2.7. Consider the Hamiltonian function

$$H = \frac{1}{2}y_1^2 + \frac{1}{2}y_2^2 + x_2 + \epsilon y_2 f(x_1), \quad (2.27)$$

with $(y_1, y_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $(x_1, x_2) \in S^1 \times \mathbb{R}$, $f(x_1) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-n} \sin(nx_1)$ and with non-standard symplectic form $\omega = dy_1 \wedge dy_2 + \epsilon^{-1} dx_1 \wedge dx_2$ giving the equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{y}_1 &= \partial_{y_2} H = y_2 + \epsilon f(x_1), \\ \dot{y}_2 &= -\partial_{y_1} H = -y_1, \\ \dot{x}_1 &= \epsilon \partial_{x_2} H = \epsilon, \\ \dot{x}_2 &= -\epsilon \partial_{x_1} H = -\epsilon^2 y_2 f'(x_1). \end{aligned} \tag{2.28}$$

Since $\dot{x}_1 = \epsilon \partial_{x_2} H = \epsilon$ I have $x_1 - x_{10} = \epsilon t$ so that upon writing $p = y_1 + iy_2$ and possibly translating t I obtain:

$$\dot{p} = -ip + \epsilon f(\epsilon t) = -ip + \epsilon \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-n} \sin(n\epsilon t).$$

I can integrate this directly to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} p &= \exp(-it)p_0 + \epsilon \exp(-it) \int_0^t \exp(is) f(\epsilon s) ds \\ &= \exp(-it)p_0 + \epsilon \exp(-it) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-n} \int_0^t \exp(is) \sin(n\epsilon s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

The resonances at $n = 1/\epsilon \in \mathbb{N}$ obstruct the existence of an invariant slow manifold, see also [10]. The corresponding terms are, however, exponentially small due to the factor e^{-n} . In particular

$$p(x_1) = \sum_{n=1}^{[\epsilon^{-1}]-1} \left(\frac{n\epsilon^2}{1-n^2\epsilon^2} e^{-n} \cos(nu) - \frac{i\epsilon}{1-n^2\epsilon^2} e^{-n} \sin(nu) \right),$$

or simply

$$y_1 = \eta_1(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{[\epsilon^{-1}]-1} \frac{n\epsilon^2}{1-n^2\epsilon^2} e^{-n} \cos(nx_1), \quad y_2 = \eta_2(x) = - \sum_{n=1}^{[\epsilon^{-1}]-1} \frac{\epsilon}{1-n^2\epsilon^2} e^{-n} \sin(nx_1),$$

defines a slow manifold with exponentially small $\mathcal{O}(e^{-1/\epsilon})$ error-field. Let $N(\epsilon) = [\epsilon^{-1}]$ and denote by f_N the partial sum $\sum_{n=1}^N e^{-n} \sin(nx_1)$ of f . From the geometric sum I then realize that η_1 can be written as

$$\eta_1(x_1) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{[\epsilon^{-1}]-1} n^{2k+1} \epsilon^{2k+2} e^{-n} \cos(nx_1) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \epsilon^{2k+2} (-1)^k f_{N(\epsilon)}^{(2k+1)}(x_1)$$

and similarly

$$\eta_2(x_1) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \epsilon^{2k+1} (-1)^{k+1} f_{N(\epsilon)}^{(2k)}(x_1).$$

In this form, the slow manifold can be realized to be in agreement with the result of applying the SO method to Hamilton's equations (2.28). Indeed, the SO method gives after N applications an approximation of the form

$$\eta_1^N(x_1) = \sum_{k=0}^{[\frac{N}{2}]-1} \epsilon^{2k+2} (-1)^k f^{(2k+1)}(x_1), \quad \eta_2^N(x_1) = \sum_{k=0}^{[\frac{N-1}{2}]} \epsilon^{2k+1} (-1)^{k+1} f^{(2k)}(x_1),$$

which can be verified by induction on N . The problem is linear in the fast variables, and the SO and the modified SO method therefore gives the same result.

Inserting $y_2 = \eta_2(x_1)$ into the x_2 -equation in (2.28) gives

$$\epsilon^{-2}(x_2(t) - x_{20}) = - \int_0^t \eta_2(\epsilon s) f'(\epsilon s) ds. \quad (2.29)$$

In Fig. 2.3 (a) and (b) I compare this and $\epsilon^{-1}\eta_2$ with a numerical solution ($\diamond$) obtained from the modified Runge-Kutta scheme for $\epsilon = 10^{-3}$. I used $x_{20} = 0$ and $\delta\tau = 0.5$.




FIGURE 2.3. Comparison of analytic solution (full line) with numerical solution ($\diamond$) obtained from applying the modified Runge-Kutta scheme for $\epsilon = 10^{-3}$ to (2.28).

In the following section I will explain the SOF method which will be used to approximate the fibers.

2.3. Fiber approximation using the SOF method. Let M_h be of saddle type, with a stable manifold $W^s(M_h)$ of dimension n_f^s and an unstable manifold $W^u(M_h)$ of dimension n_f^u ($n_f = n_f^s + n_f^u$). Then Fenichel's theory shows that there exists a local transformation $(u, v, w) \mapsto (x, y)$, with $\dim\{v\} = n_f^s$ and $\dim\{w\} = n_f^u$, mapping (1.1) into the *Fenichel normal form* [16]:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{u} &= \epsilon(U_0(u) + U_1(u, v, w)vw), \\ \dot{v} &= V(u, v, w)v, \\ \dot{w} &= W(u, v, w)w. \end{aligned} \quad (2.30)$$

Here $U_1(u, v, w) : \{v\} \times \{w\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n_s}$ is a bilinear function of v and w . The slow manifold is then given by $\{v = 0, w = 0\}$ with stable manifold $\{w = 0\}$ and unstable manifold $\{v = 0\}$. Note in particular, that the slow vector-field is independent of the fast variables to linear order. The SOF method approaches this ideal. To explain this first assume that the SO method, or the modified SO method, has been applied for an approximation of the slow manifold $y = \eta(x)$. Then introduce y_0 by $y = \eta(x) + y_0$ so that

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= \epsilon(\Lambda(x) + \mu_0(x)y_0 + T(x, y_0)), \\ \dot{y}_0 &= A(x_0)y_0 + R(x_0, y_0), \end{aligned}$$

neglecting the exponentially small terms. Here $\Lambda(x) = X(x, \eta(x))$, $\mu_0(x) = \partial_y X(x, \eta(x))$ and

$$A(x) = -\epsilon \partial_x \eta \partial_y X(x, \eta(x)) + \partial_y Y(x, \eta(x)),$$

while $R, T = \mathcal{O}(y_0^2)$. I then seek a transformation of the slow variables of the form

$$x = x_0 + \epsilon \phi_0(x_0)y_0, \quad (2.31)$$

pushing the error $\gamma = \|\mu_0\|_\chi$ to higher in ϵ . Here $\phi_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_s \times n_f}$. This gives

$$\dot{x}_0 = \epsilon \Lambda(x_0) + \epsilon \{ \partial_x \Lambda(x_0) \epsilon \phi_0(x_0) + \mu_0(x_0) - \phi_0(x_0) A(x_0) + \mu_1(x_0) \} y_0 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon y_0^2). \quad (2.32)$$

where μ_1 is

$$\mu_1(x_0) = -\epsilon \partial_x \phi_0(x_0) \Lambda(x_0).$$

Here $\partial_x \phi_0$ times Λ is understood column-wise. In the SOF method one is looking for a solution $\phi_0 = \phi$ that makes the curly brackets (2.32) vanish:

$$\partial_x \Lambda \epsilon \phi + \mu_0 - \phi A + \mu_1 = 0. \quad (2.33)$$

As with the SO method this is then approached iteratively, letting first $\phi_0(x) \approx \mu_0(x) A(x)^{-1} = \mathcal{O}(\gamma)$ solve the linear equation

$$\epsilon \partial_x \Lambda(x_0) \phi_0(x) + \mu_0(x) - \phi_0(x) A(x) = 0. \quad (2.34)$$

Then the new error is μ_1 which is smaller

$$\mu_1(x) = -\epsilon \partial_x \phi_0(x) \Lambda(x) = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon \|\partial_x \phi_0\|_\chi).$$

Iterating this procedure one obtains the full SOF method:

PROPOSITION 2.8. *(The SOF method [39]) Provided ϵ is sufficiently small, then the function $\phi = \sum_{n=0}^{N(\epsilon)} \phi_n$, $N(\epsilon) = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-1})$, where the ϕ_n 's satisfy the linear equations*

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_x \Lambda \epsilon \phi_n + \mu_n - \phi_n A &= 0, \\ \mu_n &= -\epsilon \partial_x \phi_{n-1} \Lambda, \\ \partial_x \Lambda(x) &= \partial_x X_0(x, \eta) + \partial_y X_0(x, \eta) \partial_x \eta, \\ A(x) &= -\epsilon \partial_x \eta \partial_y X_0(x, \eta) + \partial_y Y_0(x, \eta) \end{aligned}$$

solves (2.33) up to exponentially small error

$$\partial_x \Lambda \epsilon \phi + \mu_0 - \phi A y_0 - \epsilon \partial_x \phi \Lambda = \mathcal{O}(e^{-c/\epsilon}), \quad (2.35)$$

for some constant $c > 0$ independent of ϵ .

Proof. I refer the reader to [39]. $\square$

As for the modified SO method it also here suffices to replace $A = A_0 + a$ in (2.34) by A_0 since $\|a\| = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon + \delta_0)$ is small and can therefore along with $\partial_x \Lambda \epsilon \phi_n$ be combined into error at the following step $\mu_{n+1} = -\epsilon \partial_x \phi_n \Lambda + \partial_x \Lambda \epsilon \phi_n - \phi_n a$. Indeed, the last two error terms are by Cauchy estimates subordinate to the first error and the exponential estimates can therefore also be obtained in this case. I combine this with the case where $\eta = \eta^h$ is determined from the discretized SO method in the following proposition:

PROPOSITION 2.9. *Assume that the conditions (2.15) and (2.18) hold true and let η^h be given as in Proposition 2.4. Then provided ϵ is sufficiently small, the function $\phi^h = \sum_{n=0}^{N(\epsilon)} \phi_n^h$, $N(\epsilon) = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{-1})$, where*

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_n^h(x) &= \mu_n(x) A_0(x)^{-1}, \\ \mu_n(x) &= -\epsilon \delta_x^h \phi_{n-1}(x) X_0(x, \eta^h(x)) \\ &\quad + (\partial_x X_0(x, \eta^h(x)) + \partial_y X_0(x, \eta^h(x)) \delta_x^h \eta^h(x)) \epsilon \phi_{n-1}(x) \\ &\quad - \phi_{n-1}(x) a(x), \\ A_0(x) &= -\epsilon \partial_x \eta_0(x) \partial_y X_0(x, \eta_0(x)) + \partial_y Y_0(x, \eta_0(x)), \\ a(x) &= -\epsilon \delta_x^h \eta^h(x) \partial_y X_0(x, \eta^h(x)) + \partial_y Y_0(x, \eta^h(x)) - A_0(x). \end{aligned}$$

solves (2.33) up to the error

$$\mathcal{O}(\epsilon h^p + e^{-c/\epsilon}).$$

Proof. I can proceed as it was argued for Proposition 2.4. I just note that $\partial_x \Lambda = \partial_x X_0(x, \eta^h(x)) + \partial_y X_0(x, \eta^h(x)) \partial_x \eta^h(x)$ has been replaced by

$$\partial_x X_0(x, \eta^h(x)) + \partial_y X_0(x, \eta^h(x)) \delta_x^h \eta^h(x).$$

□ Since the function ϕ^h enters the transformation (2.31) as $\epsilon \phi^h$ this error appears as $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2 h^p + e^{-c/\epsilon})$ as in (2.23) and subordinate to the error in (2.21). This is also why I here settle with approximating $\partial_x \eta^h$ by $\delta_x^h \eta^h$ instead of $\partial_x \eta_0 + \delta_x^h(\eta^h - \eta_0)$ (as it was done in Corollary 2.5).

EXAMPLE 2.10. *The function $\epsilon \phi$ can also be computed explicitly for the linear toy problem in Example 2.6:*

$$\epsilon \phi = \epsilon \begin{pmatrix} -1 & \cos x_2 \\ -\sin x_1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2).$$

Again I use Maple and include terms up to order ϵ^8 . In Fig. 2.4 I compare this with a numerical solution $\epsilon \phi^h$ at $x = (-0.5, -0.7)^T$ taking again $h = \epsilon$. In agreement with the analysis, I see that the order is $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^4)$.




FIGURE 2.4. Comparison of $\epsilon \phi^h$ with $\epsilon \phi$ for the toy problem (2.24).

In the following section I combine the iterative methods to obtain a method to approximate the motion near a saddle-point slow manifold.

3. Using η and ϕ to obtain non-stiff subproblems - The SO-SMST method. The following transformation:

$$(x_0, y_0) \mapsto (x = x_0 + \epsilon \phi(x_0) y_0, y = \eta(x) + y_0),$$

transforms (1.2) into

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_0 &= \epsilon \Lambda(x_0) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon y_0^2), \\ \dot{y}_0 &= A(x_0) y_0 + \mathcal{O}(y_0^2), \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

ignoring the exponentially small terms. Recall that $\Lambda(x_0) = X(x_0, \eta(x_0))$. I shall also ignore the remainder $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon y_0^2)$ in (3.1) and just consider

$$\dot{x}_0 = \epsilon \Lambda(x_0), \tag{3.2}$$

or

$$x'_0 = \Lambda(x_0). \quad (3.3)$$

I have formally decoupled the slow variables from the fast ones. I will quantify the error in Proposition 3.1 below. However, within this approximation, the fast variables can be solved for using

$$\dot{y} = Y(x, y), \quad (3.4)$$

$$x = x_0 + \epsilon \phi(x_0)(I_f + \partial_x \eta(x_0) \epsilon \phi(x_0))^{-1}(y - \eta(x_0)), \quad (3.5)$$

which is a non-autonomous system once $x_0 = x_0(\tau)$ has been obtained from (3.3). Here $I_f = \text{id} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_f \times n_f}$. The equation for $x = x(x_0, y)$ (3.5) has been obtained by inserting $x = x_0 + \epsilon \phi(x_0)y_0$ into $y_0 = y - \eta(x)$ and Taylor expanding about $y_0 = 0$. This introduces an error of $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3 y_0^2)$ which is subordinate to the remainder $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon y_0^2)$ I ignored in (3.1).

I shall use this principle near a saddle type slow manifold constructing the type of trajectories that are computed by the SMST algorithm. Consider a base trajectory $x_0 = x_0(\tau)$ solving (3.3) with $x_0(0) = x_{00}$ and $x_0(T) = x_{0T}$. I then wish to compute an approximation to a trajectory connecting to such base trajectory, in the sense that it decays to the base trajectory exponentially fast at one end and escapes from it exponentially fast at the other end. I do this as it is done in the SMST algorithm [13] specifying the stable components $y_{s0} = \pi_s^z(y - \eta(x(0)))$ at $t = 0$ and the unstable ones $y_{uT} = \pi_u^z(y - \eta(x(T)))$ at the other end $t = T/\epsilon$. In particular, I use the approximation

$$y - \eta(x) = (I_f + \partial_x \eta(x_0) \epsilon \phi(x_0))^{-1}(y - \eta(x_0)) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2 y_0^2),$$

also used in (3.5), to write these components as

$$y_{s0} = \pi_s^z(I_f + \partial_x \eta(x_{00}) \epsilon \phi(x_{00}))^{-1}(y - \eta(x_{00})),$$

resp.

$$y_{uT} = \pi_u^z(I_f + \partial_x \eta(x_{0T}) \epsilon \phi(x_{0T}))^{-1}(y - \eta(x_{0T})).$$

In contrast to the SMST algorithm, however, collocation is only performed on the fast y -space as I have already approximated the base trajectory. Moreover, I only need to consider time intervals of order $t = \mathcal{O}(1)$ in each end. This means that the vector-field in this collocation problem has no ϵ^{-1} factor. As such it is well-conditioned. The length of the time intervals can be estimated through the eigenvalues of $\partial_y Y(x, \eta(x))$. Suppose that $r_0 = \|y_{s0}\|$ is small and that $\lambda_s > 0$ is a lower estimate of the absolute values of the real parts of the eigenvalues of $\partial_y Y(x, \eta(x))$ with negative real parts, then

$$t_0 = -\lambda_s^{-1} \log \left(\frac{\text{tol}}{r_0} \right),$$

is an estimate for how long it takes y_0 to decrease below a given tolerance tol ($\ll \epsilon r_0^2$ cf. (3.6) below). At $t = t_0$ I then enforce the condition that the unstable components of $y = y(t_0)$, that is $\pi_u^z(y - \eta(x_0(\epsilon t_0)))$, vanish. At the other end, I then let $r_T = \|y_{uT}\|$ and suppose that $\lambda_u > 0$ is a lower estimate of the real parts of the eigenvalues of $\partial_y Y(x, \eta(x))$ with positive real part. Then

$$t_1 = -\lambda_u^{-1} \log \left(\frac{\text{tol}}{r_T} \right),$$

is an estimate for how long it takes y_0 to decrease below, now in backward time, a given tolerance tol ($\ll \epsilon r_T^2$). At $t = T/\epsilon - t_1$ I therefore enforce the condition that the stable components of $y = y(T/\epsilon - t_1)$, that is $\pi_s^z(y - \eta(x_0(T - \epsilon t_1)))$, vanish. This defines two boundary value problems on the fast space, each only involving $\mathcal{O}(1)$ -many equations. They are solved by the same collocation principle as used in the SMST algorithm on the full space. For $t \in (t_0, T/\epsilon - t_1)$ I set $y(t) = \eta(x_0(t))$, that is $y_0 = 0$. Finally, $x = x(\tau)$ is obtained from (3.5). I refer to this method as the SO-SMST method.

Having described the trajectories considered, I return to the error introduced from replacing (3.1) by (3.2):

PROPOSITION 3.1. *Suppose that $y_0 = y_0(t)$ decays exponentially fast to the slow manifold $y_0 = 0$ in one end and escapes it exponentially fast at the other end. That is assume that there exists a positive constant λ so that*

$$\|y_0(t)\| \leq r (\exp(-\lambda t) + \exp(-\lambda(T/\epsilon - t))),$$

for $t \in [0, T/\epsilon]$, where $r = \max\{\|y_0(0)\|, \|y_0(T/\epsilon)\|\}$. Then the error $\Delta x_0 = \Delta x_0(\tau)$, taking $\Delta x_0(0) = 0$, from replacing (3.1) by (3.2) is

$$\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{-1}\epsilon r^2) \quad \text{for all } \tau \in [0, T]. \quad (3.6)$$

Proof. Given that $\Delta x_0(0) = 0$ and (3.1) then Δx_0 satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta x_0(\tau) &\leq L \int_0^\tau \Delta x_0(s) ds + Cr^2 \int_0^\tau (\exp(-2\lambda\epsilon^{-1}s) + \exp(-2\lambda\epsilon^{-1}(T-s))) ds \\ &\leq L \int_0^\tau \Delta x_0(s) ds + C\lambda^{-1}\epsilon r^2, \end{aligned}$$

with $L = \sup_x \|\partial_x \Lambda\|$ and some $C > 0$, for ϵ and r sufficiently small. Applying Gronwall's inequality in integral form [1] then gives

$$\Delta x_0(\tau) \leq C\lambda^{-1}\epsilon r^2 \exp(LT) \quad \text{for all } \tau \in [0, T],$$

from which the result follows. $\square$

REMARK 3.2. *For the trajectories computed in [13] where the stable and unstable components are taken from the critical manifold, setting $(1.7)|_{\epsilon=0}$ resp. $(1.8)|_{\epsilon=0}$ to 0, this gives $r = \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ and an error of order $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^3)$.*

The error Δx_0 from replacing (3.1) by (3.2) gives rise to an error Δy_0 in y_0 . I describe this in the following proposition:

PROPOSITION 3.3. *Let $\tilde{y}_0$ be the solution obtained of (3.4) using (3.3) and (3.5) and set $\Delta y_0 = \tilde{y}_0 - y_0$. Then there exist constants C_1 and C_2 independent of ϵ and r so that:*

$$\|\Delta y_0(t)\| \leq (\|\Delta y_0(0)\| + C_1\epsilon r^2 t_0) \exp(C_2 t_0), \quad (3.7)$$

for all $t \in [0, t_0]$.

Proof. It directly follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta y_0(t)\| &\leq \|\Delta y_0(0)\| + \int_0^t \int_0^1 \|\partial_x Y(x + s\Delta x_0, y_0 + s\Delta y_0)\| \|\Delta x_0\| ds dt \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_0^1 \|\partial_y Y(x + s\Delta x_0, y_0 + s\Delta y_0)\| \|\Delta y_0\| ds dt. \end{aligned}$$

Now use (3.6) and Gronwall's inequality in integral form to obtain (3.7). $\square$

EXAMPLE 3.4. *In this example I consider the following linear singular perturbed boundary value problem:*

$$\epsilon u''(\tau) + u'(\tau) = 1, \quad u(0) = 1 = u(1),$$

taken from [19]. Setting $x = u$ and $y = \epsilon u'$ I can write this as a slow-fast system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= y \\ \dot{y} &= -y + \epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

with respect to the fast time $t = \epsilon^{-1}\tau$. Here $y = 0$ with $\epsilon = 0$ is a normally hyperbolic critical manifold. The SOF method gives $\eta = \epsilon$ and $\epsilon\phi = -1$ both exact in one single step. Since the problem is linear with $\epsilon\phi$ independent of x this also implies that the SO-SMST method gives the true solution

$$u(\tau) = \tau + \frac{1 + e^{-\tau/\epsilon}}{1 - e^{-1/\epsilon}},$$

up to any desired accuracy uniformly in $\epsilon \ll 1$. This is not the case for the SMST method unless a Shishkin mesh is employed, see e.g. [19].

4. Numerical results for a model for reciprocal inhibition. To demonstrate the SO-SMST method I consider a model for a pair of neurons coupled by reciprocal inhibition [36]:

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{q}_1 &= \epsilon(-q_1 + sv_1), \\ \dot{q}_2 &= \epsilon(-q_2 + sv_2), \\ \dot{v}_1 &= -\left(v_1 - a \tanh\left(\frac{\sigma_1 v_1}{a}\right) + q_1 + \omega f(v_2)(v_1 - r)\right), \\ \dot{v}_2 &= -\left(v_2 - a \tanh\left(\frac{\sigma_2 v_2}{a}\right) + q_2 + \omega f(v_1)(v_2 - r)\right),\end{aligned}$$

with

$$f(x) = (1 + \exp(-4\gamma(x - \theta)))^{-1}.$$

Here the fast variables v_1 and v_2 are interpreted as the membrane potential of two neurons coupled synaptically through the terms involving f . The slow variables q_1 and q_2 represent the gating of membrane channels in the neurons. The model does not incorporate the fast membrane currents, and in that sense it is slightly caricatural. However, still more reduced models have been used to study reciprocal inhibition of a pair of neurons [37, 43]. The model was also considered in [13], the paper presenting the SMST algorithm. I use the same parameter values as in [11, 13]:

$$\omega = 0.03, \gamma = 10, r = -4, \theta = 0.01333, a = 1, s = 1, \sigma_1 = 3 \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_2 = 1.2652372051.$$

4.1. Computation of base trajectory. I compute a trajectory segment on the slow manifold, which includes the segment B' in Figure 6 (c) in [11], using the modified Runge-Kutta scheme that includes the SO method for the approximation of the slow manifold. The time T was set to 0.5. I use the fact that the critical manifold can easily be written as $q = \eta_0^{-1}(v)$ from which I also obtain $\partial_q \eta_0$. As opposed to Example 2.6 the vector-field U is now nonlinear in the fast variables, and therefore there is now a real difference between the modified and the traditional SO methods (recall Remark 2.2). For this case I found it useful to first use the traditional SO method a few times to ensure that the error was below ϵ and then applied the modified SO-method, presented in Proposition 2.1, for the consecutive steps. The result for $\epsilon = 10^{-3}$ is shown in Fig. 4.1 in terms of projections onto the (q_1, v_1, v_2) -space (a) and the (q_1, v_1) -plane (b). The thick line is the computed trajectory on the slow manifold. In forward time the flow is from the lower left to the upper right. At the tip of this trajectory I have included some trajectories with initial conditions that are displayed from the slow manifold by distances of $\pm 10^{-10}$ along the stable and unstable manifold. These were obtained from direct integration using Matlab's ode15s with tolerances set to $\text{tol} = 10^{-10}$. I use $\delta\tau = 10^{-2}$ in the Runge-Kutta scheme and $h = 10^{-4} < \epsilon^{-1}\delta\tau^{5/2} = 10^{-2}$. Again I highlight that it is not possible to compute such a trajectory directly using the SMST algorithm. With the SMST algorithm such a trajectory will include fast transients. The segment I have computed is much longer than the one in [11]. To realize this one can for example compare Fig. 4.1 (b) with Figure 6 (c) in [11]. It took 0.01 seconds to compute the trajectory in Matlab on an Intel Core i7-3520M 2.90 GHz processor. This time includes the computation of $\epsilon\phi$ which I will use in the next subsection.

4.2. Computation of transients. Next, I compute trajectories using the SO-SMST method described in section 3 that connect to the trajectory $z = z(\tau)$ Fig. 4.1 (b) near its starting point

$$\begin{aligned}(q_1, q_2)(0) &= (-0.51723351869, -0.73434299772), \\ (v_1, v_2)(0) &= (-0.27894449516, 1.71095643157),\end{aligned}$$

and leave it near its end point

$$\begin{aligned}(q_1, q_2)(T) &= (-0.39340933174, 0.00310289762), \\ (v_1, v_2)(T) &= (-0.15410414452, 0.72034762953).\end{aligned}$$

An example is shown in Fig. 4.2 (a) as projection onto the (v_1, v_2, q_1) -space. The trajectory is obtained using the SO-SMST method with $\delta t = \delta\tau = 0.01$. At $\tau = 0$ I fix the v_2 -value to 1.71095643157 while v_1




FIGURE 4.1. The thick lines in (a) and (b) represent two projections of a trajectory on the slow manifold for the model of reciprocal inhibition. Trajectories with initial conditions that are displaced from the slow manifold by distances of $\pm 10^{-10}$ along the stable and unstable manifold are displayed using thinner lines at the tip of this base trajectory. The thicker of the two sets of thinner lines, going in the v_2 -direction, corresponds to trajectories on the stable manifold. The set of lines going in the v_1 direction corresponds to trajectories on the unstable manifold. These are obtained by direct backward resp. forward integration.

is fixed to be -0.025410414452 at $\tau = T$. This gives a distance of $r = 0.1$ from the slow manifold at both ends. In (b) I compare this with an accurate reference trajectory obtained using the SMST algorithm by plotting the Euclidean norm of the difference of the two solutions as a function of time. There is a good agreement between the two trajectories, the maximal error being $\approx 7.5 \times 10^{-6}$. This value is in some sense also consistent with Proposition 3.1: Here $\epsilon = 10^{-3}$ and $r = 0.1$ so $\epsilon r^2 = 10^{-5}$. The computation of the approximation using the principle in section 3, which is visualized using the projections in Fig. 4.2 (a) took 1.6 seconds. The 1.6 seconds include the time required for the propagation of the base trajectory and the time for the collocation on the fast space. Fig. 4.3 display $v_1 = v_1(\tau)$ (a) and $v_2 = v_2(\tau)$ (b). Here the fast transients are clearly visible. Finally, I highlight that if I used the resulting time mesh from the SO-SMST method, t -fine at the ends, τ -fine in-between, in the SMST collocation method then I get an accuracy of 3.0×10^{-8} but it took about twice as long (3.1 seconds to be precise). I continued in this way for smaller values of ϵ while fixing $r = 0.1$, computing trajectories using the SO-SMST method, and then using the resulting time mesh in the SMST collocation method. The time used for the collocation method was still about twice as long, but more importantly the SMST method did not converge for smaller values of ϵ than $\epsilon = 5 \times 10^{-6}$. The two methods use the same Matlab collocation code. In fairness, I again stress that, as opposed to the considerations in [14], I have fixed the distance r from the slow manifold while decreasing ϵ .

In Fig. 4.4 (a) I use the principle from section 3 and compare it with the SMST algorithm for three different values of $r = 0.1, 0.5$ and 1 , showing the last part of the trajectories for these three different cases. The thick line is based on the principle from section 3 while the thinner lines are due to the SMST algorithm. The error increases with increasing r . In (b) the square of r in (3.6) is verified by computing the slope ≈ 2 of the maximal error as a function of r on a logarithm scale. Here the maximal error is again understood as the maximum over $\tau \in [0, T]$ of the Euclidean distances between the trajectories obtained from the two methods using an accurate SMST solution as a reference.

By applying the SO-SMST procedure I have reduced the problem into non-stiff subproblems and as such the singular nature of the original problem have been removed. Therefore there no numerical issues appear when ϵ becomes extremely small. In Fig. 4.5 I compute similar trajectories to the ones above but consider ϵ being extremely small. I again fix the distance from the slow manifold to be $r = 0.1$ in both ends. In (a) the exit trajectories are shown in the (v_1, q_1) -plane while (b) shows the the time required as a function of ϵ . I recognize the ≈ 1.6 seconds for $\epsilon = 10^{-3}$.

5. Numerical results for FitzHugh-Nagumo model. The FitzHugh-Nagumo model is a PDE model for the membrane potential of a nerve axon which is derived as a simplification of the Hodgkin-Huxley




FIGURE 4.2. In (a): A trajectory computed using the principle in section 3. In (b): The trajectory in (a) is compared with a trajectory computed using the SMST algorithm.




FIGURE 4.3. v_1 (a) and v_2 (b) for the trajectory shown in Fig. 4.2 (a).

model:

$$\partial_t u = \epsilon(v - \gamma u), \quad \partial_t v = d\partial_s^2 v + f_a(v) - u + p, \quad s \in \mathbb{R}^3.$$

with $f_a(u) = u(u - a)(1 - u)$ and parameters p, γ, d and a . When looking for traveling wave solutions of the form $u(t, s) = x(s + ct)$, $v(t, s) = y_1(s + ct)$, $y_2 = y_1'$ one obtains the following finite dimensional slow-fast system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= \epsilon(y_1 - \gamma x), \\ \dot{y}_1 &= y_2, \\ \dot{y}_2 &= \frac{1}{d}(cy_2 - f_a(y_1) + x - p). \end{aligned}$$

Geometric singular perturbation theory has been used successfully to analyze this system, see e.g. [16, 14, 20] and references therein. In particular, the Exchange Lemma has been applied to prove the existence of homoclinic orbits including both fast and slow segments. Homoclinic orbits correspond, by the traveling




FIGURE 4.4. In (a): Transients for three different values of $r = 0.1, 0.5$ and 1 . The thick lines are obtained using the SO-SMST principle described in section 3 while the thinner lines are due to the SMST algorithm. In (b): The maximal error as a function of r . The slope on the logarithm scale is ≈ 2.0 .




FIGURE 4.5. The results of computing canards and their transients by the SO-SMST method for extremely small values of ϵ . Figure (a) shows the different exit trajectories projected onto the (v_1, q_1) -plane. In (b) the time used by the SO-SMST method is plotted as a function of ϵ . The circles (o) give the total time, while the crosses (x) give the time required to compute the base trajectory.

wave ansatz, to traveling pulse solutions of the PDEs. I shall, as a further proof of concept, compute such trajectories. I shall as in [13] restrict attention to $a = 1/10$ and $d = 5$, and I also set $f \equiv f_{1/10}$.

To explain an example of a homoclinic orbit I first note that the one-dimensional critical manifold

$$M_0 = \{y_2 = 0, x = f(y_1) + p\} = M_0^l \cup \{z_{lm}\} \cup M_0^m \cup \{z_{mr}\} \cup M_0^r,$$

has three different normal hyperbolic components M_0^l , M_0^m and M_0^r separated by two fold points $z_{lm} \approx (-0.0024 + p, 0.049, 0)$ and $z_{mr} \approx (0.13 + p, 0.68, 0)$. These objects are all contained within the plane $y_2 = 0$. An example for $p = 0$ is shown in Fig. 5.1 (a). For ϵ sufficiently small Fenichel's theory imply that $M_0^l \setminus B_\rho(z_{lm})$, $M_0^m \setminus \{B_\rho(z_{lm}) \cup B_\rho(z_{mr})\}$ and $M_0^r \setminus B_\rho(z_{mr})$ all perturb to some M^l , M^m and M^r . I have here removed small neighborhoods $B_\rho(z_{lm})$ and $B_\rho(z_{rm})$ of the fold points z_{lm} resp. z_{mr} from the considerations as the hyperbolicity assumption of Fenichel's theorems is violated there. For $p = 0$ the point $q = (0, 0, 0)$ is

the unique equilibrium and the results of e.g. [16, 20] give that for ϵ sufficiently small there exists a c_* , a z_r^{approach} , a z_r^{exit} and a z_l^{approach} so that for $c = c_*$ there is a homoclinic connection to q composed of four segments: (i) a fast segment along the strong unstable manifold of q connecting to M^r close to $z_r^{\text{approach}} \in M^r$; (ii) a slow segment on M^r initiated near z_r^{approach} and terminated near $z_r^{\text{exit}} \in M^r$; (iii) a fast segment leaving M^r near z_r^{exit} and approaching M^l near $z_l^{\text{approach}} \in M^l$; (iv) a slow segment on M^l initiated near z_l^{approach} and eventually terminating at $q = (0, 0, 0)$. This orbit is obtained by transversality (using the Exchange Lemma and Fenichel's theory) from a singular orbit whose projection onto the (x, y_1) -plane is shown in Fig. 5.1 (b).




FIGURE 5.1. (a): The critical manifold $M_0 \subset \{(x, y_1, y_2) | y_2 = 0\}$ and its three hyperbolic components M_0^l , M_0^m and M_0^r for $p = 0$. (b): The singular orbit from which a true homoclinic connection can be established by transversality.

I consider $p = 0$ and compute the homoclinic connection to the equilibrium at $(0, 0, 0)$ using the following recipe:

- 1° Determination of c and the strong unstable manifold of the equilibrium $(0, 0, 0)$: I use the fact that $W^s(M^r)$ splits the phase space as in [14]. The resulting trajectory is terminated at $y_2 = 0$. Denote this fast segment by γ_1 .
- 2° Computation of M^r and the connection of γ_1 to M^r : Using the function ϕ I project the end-point γ_1 onto M^r neglecting terms of order $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon y_0^2)$, with y_0 measuring the deviation from M^r . I then use my Runge-Kutta scheme to compute $M^r = \{y = \eta_r(x)\}$. The connection from the end of γ_1 to M^r is computed using the SO-SMST algorithm. I denote this segment γ_2 .
- 3° Computation of M^l : I integrate backwards from $(0, 0, 0)$ using my Runge-Kutta scheme to obtain $M^l = \{y = \eta_l(x)\}$.
- 4° Computation of $W^u(M^r) \cap W^s(M^l)$: I use Newton's method to obtain a root of the function:

$$F(x_b^r, x_b^l) = (x^r, y_2^r)(x_b^r) - (x^l, y_2^l)(x_b^l),$$

(x^r, y_2^r) being the intersection of a trajectory on $W^u(M^r)$, obtained by forward integration, with the plane $y_1 = 1/2$ that was initiated at a point $(x_b^r, \eta_r(x_b^r))$ on M^r . Similarly (x^l, y_2^l) is the intersection of a trajectory on $W^s(M^l)$, obtained by backward integration, with the plane $y_1 = 1/2$ that was initiated at a point $(x_b^l, \eta_l(x_b^l))$ on M^l . The Jacobian is computed through the variational equations. Here I also use the knowledge of $\partial_x \eta_r$ and $\partial_x \eta_l$. The resulting trajectory is denoted by γ_3 . It includes a slow segment on M^r taken us from the end of γ_2 to the point of departure $(x_b^r, \eta_r(x_b^r))$.

- 5° The final slow segment γ_4 is taken from M^l from the entrance point $(x_b^l, \eta_l(x_b^l))$ to $(0, 0, 0)$.

The union of the segments $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$, and γ_4 forms our homoclinic orbit. The result is shown in Fig. 5.2. I obtain $c = 1.2462875$ for $p = 0$. In Fig. 5.3 I can see using a close-up the result of step 2° for $\epsilon = 10^{-3}$. There is an error in the connection with γ_1 to γ_2 that is not visible. It is too small: 5×10^{-9} . A simpler alternative to the projection method used here, that is based on the determination of the function ϕ , would be to use

the “naive” fiber projection: $(x, y) \mapsto (x, \eta(x))$, see also Fig. 4.1 in [40]. This projection is $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon r)$ -close to the correct one. If I apply this here then I get a slightly larger error of 2×10^{-6} in the connection. There is an improvement by factor of 10^{-3} using the more accurate projection without any detectable increase in time.




FIGURE 5.2. The homoclinic orbit for $p = 0$, $c = 1.2462875$ and $\epsilon = 10^{-3}$. Figure (b) shows the projection onto the (x, y_1) -plane. The thin dotted lines indicate the critical manifold.




FIGURE 5.3. The result of the step 2^o for $\epsilon = 10^{-3}$ and $p = 0$. The full thick line shows the incoming trajectory γ_1 from step 1^o. The thin line shows the base trajectory on M^r obtained by projection through ϕ . The thick dotted line is γ_2 , the result of applying the SO-SMST algorithm to connect γ_1 to M^r . There is a discrepancy at the connection of γ_1 with γ_2 . It is however small and not visible being only 5×10^{-9} .

6. Conclusion. I presented an alternative method for the computation of canards using iterative methods to approximate the slow manifold and its fiber projections. This included a numerical implementation of a modified SO method (also known as the iterative method of Fraser and Roussel) in a classical fourth

order Runge-Kutta scheme for the computation of these unstable trajectories on the slow manifold. This part applies to other types of slow manifolds even normally elliptic ones. For the computation of transients the SOF method for the approximation of fibers was augmented and a principle of splitting the problem into two non-stiff subproblems was outlined and demonstrated on a model of reciprocal inhibition and on the FitzHugh-Nagumo model. This principle benefits from the fact that the singular nature of the problem has been removed - there are as such no problems encountered when letting ϵ become extremely small.

7. Acknowledgement. I would like to thank Morten Brøns for helpful discussions and providing valuable feedback in the preparation of this document.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Bellmann. The stability of solutions of linear differential equations. 10:643–647, 1981.
- [2] M. Brøns. Canard explosion of limit cycles in templator models of self-replication mechanisms. *Journal of Chemical Physics*, 134(144105), 2011.
- [3] M. Brøns. An iterative method for the canard explosion in general planar systems. *arXiv:1209.1109 [math.DS]*, 2012.
- [4] M. Brøns and K. Uldall Kristiansen. A modified version of Fraser-Roussel’s iterative method for the approximation of the canard explosion point. *Manuscript*, 2014.
- [5] J. Butcher. *Numerical Methods for Ordinary Differential Equations*, volume 3. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 2003.
- [6] N. Fenichel. Persistence and smoothness of invariant manifolds for flows. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal*, 21:193–226, 1971.
- [7] N. Fenichel. Asymptotic stability with rate conditions. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal*, 23:1109–1137, 1974.
- [8] S.J. Fraser. The steady state and equilibrium approximations: a geometrical picture. *Journal of Chemical Physics*, 88:4732–4738, 1990.
- [9] C. W. Gear, T. J. Kaper, I. G. Kevrekidis, and A. Zagaris. Projecting to a slow manifold: Singularly Perturbed Systems and Legacy Codes. *SIAM Journal of Applied Dynamical Systems*, 4(3):711–732, 2005.
- [10] V. Gelfreich and L. Lerman. Almost invariant elliptic manifold in a singularly perturbed Hamiltonian system. *Nonlinearity*, 15:447–557, 2002.
- [11] J. Guckenheimer, K. Hoffman, and W. Weckesser. Numerical computation of canards. *International Journal of Bifurcations and Chaos in Applied Sciences and Engineering*, 4:84–97, 1992.
- [12] J. Guckenheimer, K. Hoffman, and W. Weckesser. The forced van der Pol equation I: The slow flow and its bifurcations. *SIAM Journal of Applied Dynamical Systems*, 2:1–35, 2003.
- [13] J. Guckenheimer and C. Kuehn. Computing Slow Manifolds of Saddle Type. *SIAM Journal of Applied Dynamical Systems*, 8(3):854–879, 2009.
- [14] J. Guckenheimer and C. Kuehn. Homoclinic orbits of the FitzHugh-Nagumo equation: The singular limit. *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems: Series S*, 2:851–872, 2009.
- [15] J. Guckenheimer and C. Kuehn. Homoclinic orbits of the FitzHugh-Nagumo equation: Bifurcations in the full system. *SIAM Journal of Applied Dynamical Systems*, 9:138–153, 2010.
- [16] C.K.R.T. Jones. *Geometric Singular Perturbation Theory, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Dynamical Systems (Montecatini Terme)*. Springer, Berlin, 1995.
- [17] H. G. Kaper and T. J. Kaper. Asymptotic analysis of two reduction methods for systems of chemical reactions. *Physica D*, 165:66–93, 2002.
- [18] I. G. Kevrekidis, C. W. Gear, J. M. Hyman, P. G. Kevrekidis, O. Runborg, and C. Theodoropoulos. Equation-free, coarse-grained multiscale computation: Enabling microscopic simulators to perform system-level analysis. *Communications of Mathematical Sciences*, 1(4):715–762, 2003.
- [19] N. Kopteva and E. O’Riordan. Shishkin meshes in the numerical solution of singularly perturbed differential equations. *International Journal of Numerical Analysis and Modeling*, 7:393–415, 2010.
- [20] M. Krupa, B. Sandstede, and P. Szmolyan. Fast and Slow Waves in the FitzHugh-Nagumo Equations. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 133(1):49–97, 1997.
- [21] S. H. Lam. Using CSP to understand complex chemical kinetics. *Combustion, Science and Technology*, 89:375–404, 1993.
- [22] S. H. Lam and D. A. Goussis. Understanding complex chemical kinetics with computational singular perturbation. *Proceedings of the 22nd International Symposium on Combustion, Seattle, WA*, pages 931–941, 1988.
- [23] J. Laskar. Large scale chaos in the Solar System. *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 287:9–12, 1994.
- [24] J. Laskar and M. Gastineau. Existence of collisional trajectories of Mercury, Mars and Venus with the Earth. *Nature*, 459:817–819, 11 June 2009.
- [25] E. N. Lorenz. The slow manifold - what is it? *American Meteorological Society*, 15 December, 1992.
- [26] E. N. Lorenz. Existence of a slow manifold. *Journal of the Atmospheric Sciences*, 43(15):1547–1557, 1986.
- [27] U. Maas and S. B. Pope. Simplifying chemical kinetics: Intrinsic low-dimensional manifolds in composition space. *Combustion and Flame*, 88:239–264, 1992.
- [28] R. S. MacKay. Slow manifolds. In: “*Energy Localisation and Transfer*”, eds T Dauxois, A Litvak-Hinenzon, RS MacKay, A Spanoudaki, World Scientific, pages 149–192, 2004.
- [29] D. A. McQuarrie. *Physical Chemistry: A Molecular Approach*. Sausalito: University Science Books, 1997.
- [30] L. Michaelis and M. Menten. Die Kinetik der Invertinwirkung. *Biochemische Zeitschrift*, 49:333–369, 1913.
- [31] J. D. Murray. *Mathematical Biology*, volume 19. Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 1993.
- [32] A. Neishtadt. Persistence of stability loss for dynamical bifurcation, i. *Differential Equations*, 23:1385–1390, 1987.
- [33] K. Nipp. Numerical integration of stiff ODE’s of singular perturbation type. *Journal of Applied Mathematics and Physics*, 42, 1991.
- [34] V. Rom-Kedar and D. Turaev. The symmetric parabolic resonance instability. *Nonlinearity*, 23:1325–1351, 2010.
- [35] M.R. Roussel and S.J. Fraser. Geometry of the steady-state approximation: perturbation and accelerated convergence method. *Journal of Chemical Physics*, 93:1072–1081, 1990.
- [36] P. F. Rowat and A. I. Selverston. Modeling the gastric mill central pattern generator of the lobster with a relaxation-oscillator network. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 70:1030–1053, 1993.
- [37] F. K. Skinner, N. Kopell, and E. Marder. Mechanisms for oscillation and frequency control in reciprocally inhibitory model neural networks. *Journal of Computational Neuroscience*, 1:69–87, 1994.
- [38] R. Temam. Inertial Manifolds. *The Mathematical Intelligencer*, 12(4):68–74, 1990.
- [39] K. Uldall Kristiansen, M. Brøns, and J. Starke. An iterative method for the approximation of fibers in slow-fast systems. To appear in *SIAM Journal of Applied Dynamical Systems*, 2014.
- [40] K. Uldall Kristiansen, P. Palmer, and R. M. Roberts. A unification of models of tethered satellites. *SIAM Journal of*

- Applied Dynamical Systems*, 10:1042–1069, 2011.
- [41] K. Uldall Kristiansen, P. Palmer, and R. M. Roberts. The persistence of a slow manifold with bifurcation. *SIAM Journal of Applied Dynamical Systems*, 11:661–683, 2012.
 - [42] K. Uldall Kristiansen and C. Wulff. Exponential estimates of slow manifolds. *arXiv:1208.4219v1 [math.DS]*, 2012.
 - [43] X. J. Wang and J. Rinzel. Alternating and synchronous rhythms in reciprocally inhibitory model neurons. *Neural Computation*, 4:84–97, 1992.
 - [44] A. Zagaris, C. W. Gear, T. J. Kaper, and I. G. Kevrekidis. Analysis of the accuracy and convergence of equation-free projection to a slow manifold. *ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis*, 43:757–784, 2009.
 - [45] A. Zagaris, H. G. Kaper, and T. J. Kaper. Fast and slow dynamics for the CSP method. *SIAM Journal of Multiscale Modelling and Simulation*, 2:613–638, 2004.